

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Chen et al. '997 (Chen). This basis for rejection is traversed, because the Chen reference fails to show or describe all the salient features of claim 1.

More particularly, Examiner points to FIGURE 2 of Chen and to column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 14 to show "at least first and second sensors, each of which evaluates evidence or information . . . and based on the evidence or information assigns a taxonomic (type) classification to its observation of the object." Examiner appears to have misinterpreted the text in question. The relevant text at column 3, line 65 to column 4, line 3 reads

"The plurality of sensors 205, using associated sensor processors, may each perform the well-known process of feature extraction to detect and pull out features which help discriminate the objects in each sensor's field of view and combine all feature extractions (from each sensor) as a composite input to adaptive processor 207."

The remaining portion of the relevant text, extending from column 4, lines 3 to 14, reads

"Operating in combination, adaptive processor 207 and data fusion selection processor 208 may perform . . . all levels of discrimination (detection, classification-recognition, identification, and tracking) of the object (target) using at least one predetermined algorithm(e.g., data fusion) to recognize the object of interest, differentiate the object from decoys (false targets), and produce at least one (or a predetermined combination of two or

more) weighted (system) reliability function that links the observed object with some confidence level." These statements are clear. In the Chen reference, it is not the sensors of FIGURE 2 which produce the taxonomic classification as recited in claim 1

". . . each of which [sensors] (a) evaluates evidence or information and (b) based on said evidence or information, assigns a taxonomic (type) classification to its observations of said object"

but instead it is the "adaptive processor 207 and data fusion selection processor 208" of FIGURE 2 which produce the taxonomic classification. Thus, claim 1 completely distinguishes over the Chen reference, and is patentable thereover. Claims 2 and 3 depend from patentable claim 1, and should be patentable therewith.

2. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by applicant's prior art (FIGURES 1 and 2). This basis for rejection is traversed, because the reference fails to show or describe all the salient features of claim 1.

More particularly, the arrangement of FIGURE 1 and the description make it clear that sensors 12, 14, and 16 produce taxonomic information at their output ports 12o, 14o, and 16o, respectively (page 3, lines 5-30). FIGURE 2 illustrates details of a particular sensor, and is not otherwise relevant. In the arrangement of FIGURE 1 of the application, the fusion which is performed in block 24 is a rationalization of the classification information from the various sensors. The prior art arrangement of FIGURES 1 and 2 meets the limitation of claim 1

"first and second sensors, each of which (a) evaluates evidence or information and (b) based on said evidence or information, assigns a taxonomic (type) classification"

but does not meet the additional limitations of claim 1
"fusing said evidence from at least said first and second sensors to produce compound evidence"

and

"assigning a classification based on said compound evidence"

and the prior-art arrangement of applicant's FIGURES 1 and 2 therefore fails to anticipate the recitations of claim 1 in two different manners. Claims 1 and 2 are therefore patentable over applicant's prior art FIGURES 1 and 2.

3. Claim 1 is slightly amended to provide more proper antecedent basis.

4. Reconsideration and allowance are requested of claims 1-3.

5. No fee is believed to be required for this amendment. Please charge any other fees to deposit account 50-2061.

FOR THE APPLICANT(S)

by William H. Meise

William H. Meise
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,574

Duane Morris LLP
P.O. Box 5203
Princeton, NJ 08543-5203
609-631-2453

Drawings

The attached four sheets of drawings are formalized replacements for the prior informal drawings.